



0000098691

## BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

AUG 30 2001

DOCKETED BY

sd

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

Chairman

JIM IRVIN

Commissioner

MARC SPITZER

Commissioner

IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC )  
INVESTIGATION INTO NUMBER RESOURCE )  
OPTIMIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF )  
NUMBER POOLING IN ARIZONA )

DOCKET NO. T-00000A-01-0076

DECISION NO. 63982ORDER

Open Meeting  
August 28 and August 29, 2001  
Phoenix, Arizona

BY THE COMMISSION:

FINDINGS OF FACT**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The rapid growth of competition and the proliferation of new telecommunications services have intensified the use of numbering resources. Efficient use of numbering resources is necessary to protect both carriers and customers from the expense and inconvenience that result from frequent implementation of new area codes. This Order will provide the foundation for thousands-block number pooling in Arizona to conserve numbering resources subject to the conditions contained in this Order.

**II. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY****A. State Proceedings**

2. On December 23, 1999, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or "Commission") petitioned the Federal Communication Commission ("FCC") for Expedited Delegation of Authority to Implement Number Conservation Measures. In its Petition, the ACC requested additional authority to:

...

...

- a. Implement mandatory thousands-block number pooling.
- b. Ensure efficient number use practices such as fill rates or sequential number assignment.
- c. Establish interim mandatory number utilization data reporting and forecasting requirements.
- d. Establish auditing procedures and implement random audits.
- e. Require the return of unused NXX codes (prefixes) by carriers to the code administrator.
- f. Require the return of unused or under-utilized portions of NXX codes to the Pooling Administrator when one is selected.

3. On July 20, 2000, the FCC granted, in part, the Petitions of Arizona and several other States. See, In the Matter of Numbering Resource Optimization, et. al., Docket No. 99-200 et. al., Order, (Rel. July 20, 2000) ("FCC Numbering Optimization Order"). In the FCC Numbering Optimization Order, Arizona was delegated the authority to institute thousands-block number pooling in the 480, 520, 602 and 623 NPA's and the authority to conduct audits of a carrier's use of numbering resources, consistent with national numbering guidelines.

4. On December 28, 2000, the ACC solicited competitive proposals and bids for the selection of an Interim Thousands-Block Arizona Pooling Administrator. Such proposals and bids were to be submitted no later than 4:00 p.m. Arizona time on January 30, 2001.

5. NeuStar, Inc. ("NeuStar") and Telcordia Technologies, Inc. ("Telcordia") submitted proposals and bids on January 26, 2001, and January 29, 2001, respectively.

6. On February 13, 2001, the ACC ordered that a Generic Investigation be commenced for the purpose of obtaining comments from interested parties and members of the industry concerning implementation of number pooling and other conservation methods in the State of Arizona.

7. The Procedural Order requested that interested parties and Industry comment on the following questions no later than March 7, 2001:

...

- a. Which Metropolitan Statistical Area ("MSA") should be selected for the first pooling trial?
- b. If the MSA contains multiple NPAs (area codes), which NPA should be first?
- c. What is an appropriate interval for implementing number pooling between NPAs where more than one exists in a MSA?
- d. If the geographic area of a NPA is greater than the MSA, should number pooling be implemented in the entire NPA?
- e. How soon in 2001 might a number pooling trial begin?
- f. How should number pooling costs be allocated (all carriers, pooling carriers only, only carriers within the MSA, etc.)?
- g. How should number pooling costs be recovered?
- h. Are there unique aspects of your network in Arizona as compared to those found in states where number pooling has already been implemented?
- i. Are there rate centers within the state that can be consolidated? If so which ones and how soon could it be accomplished?
- j. What degree of contamination (i.e. 5%, 10% etc.) should be allowed in thousands-blocks donated to the numbering pool?
- k. What other issues should be addressed as part of a pooling trial?
- l. What additional number conservation methods may be implemented to maximize the life of the NPAs within Arizona?

8. Written comments were subsequently filed by AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. and TCG Phoenix (collectively "AT&T"), Cox Arizona Telecom, L.L.C. ("Cox"), Qwest Corporation ("Qwest"), Time Warner Telecom of Arizona, L.L.C. ("Time Warner"), Winstar Wireless, Inc. ("Winstar"), and WorldCom, Inc. ("WorldCom").

#### **B. Related Federal Proceedings**

9. On March 31, 2000, the FCC released a Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (In The Matter of Numbering Resource Optimization, Docket No. 99-200, ("NRO")) with the stated goals of ensuring that the limited numbering resources of the North

1 American Number Plan ("NANP") are used efficiently and that all carriers have the numbering  
2 resources they need to compete in the rapidly growing market place. Adopted in this Order is a single  
3 system for allocating numbers in blocks of 1,000, wherever possible, and establishing a plan for  
4 national rollout of thousands-block number pooling.

5 10. Furthermore, in the NRO Order the FCC adopted administrative and technical measures  
6 that will promote more efficient allocation and use of NANP resources. Among the measures adopted  
7 are:

- 8 a. A uniform set of categories of numbers for which carriers must report their  
9 utilization.
- 10 b. A mandatory utilization data reporting requirement.
- 11 c. A process that requires carriers to demonstrate that they need numbering resources  
12 to provide services.
- 13 d. A utilization threshold framework to increase carrier accountability.
- 14 e. Numbering resource reclamation requirements to ensure the return of unused  
15 numbers to the NANP inventory.
- 16 f. A mandate that carriers fill their need for numbers out of "open" thousands blocks  
17 before beginning to use numbers from new blocks.

18 11. On December 8, 2000, the FCC issued a Request for Proposal ("RFP") inviting bids  
19 from three potential bidders known for having experience in numbering administration. On or about  
20 January 8, 2001, NeuStar and Telcordia provided proposals in response to the RFP. The FCC  
21 anticipated selection of the National Pooling Administrator in the first quarter of 2001 but did not do  
22 so.

23 12. The FCC continues to develop, adopt and implement a number of strategies to ensure  
24 that the numbering resources of the NANP are used efficiently. In its NRO Second Report and Order  
25 (In the Matter of Number Resource Optimization, et. al., Second Report and Order, et. al., Docket No.  
26 99-200, et. al. (Released December 29, 2000)), the FCC adopted additional measures to promote  
27 efficient allocation of NANP resources which include:

28 ...

- a. Establishment of a utilization threshold of 60% (increasing to 75% over three years) that carriers must meet before receiving additional numbering resources in a given rate center.
- b. Not setting a transition period between the time Commercial Mobile Radio Services ("CMRS") carriers must implement Local Number Portability ("LNP") (November 24, 2002) and the time they must participate in mandatory number pooling.
- c. A comprehensive audit program to verify carrier compliance with Federal rules and orders and industry guidelines.

13. On June 18, 2001, the FCC selected NeuStar as the National Thousands-Block Number Pooling Administrator. The first round of implementation is scheduled to begin in March 2002 with initial concentration on area codes in the top 100 MSAs.

### III. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

14. The following are Staff's recommendations on the twelve issues raised in the March 7, 2001 Procedural Order seeking comment from the Industry and other interested parties concerning implementation of number pooling and other conservation methods in Arizona.

#### A. Which Metropolitan Area should be selected for the first pooling trial?

15. AT&T, Qwest, Winstar and WorldCom recommended that the Phoenix MSA be selected for the first pooling trial.<sup>1</sup> Time Warner recommended the MSA with the greatest number of providers and having a NPA in jeopardy of exhaust be selected. Time Warner Comments at p. 2. Cox, on the other hand, believes that the Tucson MSA presents a more manageable location for a pooling trial. Cox Comments at p. 1.

16. The Phoenix MSA is the most populous MSA in the State, has undergone rate center consolidation and has NPAs which are most likely to exhaust first and need area code relief. According to NANPA's June 1, 2001 Exhaust Analysis, the forecasted exhaust of the 602 NPA is 1Q2006 and 2Q2008 for the 480 NPA.

17. The Tucson MSA consists of a single NPA (520) and the Tucson local calling area has also undergone rate center consolidation. The 520 NPA is in the process now of undergoing a

<sup>1</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 1; Qwest Comments at p.2; Winstar Comments at p. 1; WorldCom Comments at p. 1.

1 geographic split. Permissive dialing began on June 23, 2001, and mandatory dialing is scheduled for  
2 January 5, 2002. To avoid conflicts with the relief activity currently in progress, Staff believes that  
3 the Tucson MSA should not be selected for the first pooling trial. Further, the forecasted exhaust date  
4 after the split should be further in the future than that anticipated for 602 and 480.

5 18. Thus, Staff recommends that the Phoenix MSA should be selected for the first  
6 thousands block number pooling trial in Arizona.

7 **B. If the MSA contains multiple NPAs, which NPA should be first?**

8 19. AT&T, Qwest and Winstar recommend that number pooling initially be implemented  
9 in the 602 NPA of the Phoenix MSA.<sup>2</sup> Cox recommends the 480 NPA be selected.<sup>3</sup> Time Warner  
10 recommends the NPA in greatest jeopardy of exhaust and WorldCom recommends the NPA with the  
11 most unassigned prefixes.<sup>4</sup>

12 20. Staff agrees with the recommendations of AT&T, Qwest, Winstar and Time Warner.  
13 Staff believes that implementing number pooling in order of projected exhaust dates will best extend  
14 the life of each NPA. The Phoenix MSA comprises Maricopa and Pinal Counties and contains five  
15 NPAs (480, 602, 623, 520 and 928). In order of projected exhaust dates, the 602 NPA is first,  
16 followed by 480, and 623. NANPA will project new exhaust dates for 520 and 928 after completion  
17 of the geographic split. Thus Staff recommends that number pooling be established in the 602 NPA  
18 first followed by the 480 NPA.

19 **C. What is an appropriate interval for implementing number pooling between NPAs where**  
20 **more than one exists in a MSA?**

21 21. AT&T recommends 4 months as an appropriate interval between NPAs.<sup>5</sup> Other  
22 suggested intervals were three to six months (Cox), six months (Qwest) and three months (Winstar).<sup>6</sup>  
23 Time Warner did not provide a recommendation and WorldCom recommended the FCC specified  
24 ...

25 ...

26 <sup>2</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 1; Qwest Comments at p. 2; Winstar Comments at p. 1.

27 <sup>3</sup> Cox Comments at p. 1.

28 <sup>4</sup> Time Warner Comments at p. 4; WorldCom Comments at p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Cox Comments at p. 1; Qwest Comments at p. 3; Winstar Comments at p. 1.

1 interval of three NPAs per quarter established by the Number Portability Administration Center  
2 ("NPAC") be followed.<sup>7</sup>

3 22. While the views expressed by the commenters ranged from six months to three months,  
4 Staff believes that unique circumstances should allow for shorter intervals between NPAs in the  
5 Phoenix MSA. The NPAs are in the same rate center, thus some carriers may have only one switch  
6 providing service to multiple NPAs in the local calling area.

7 23. Experience from other jurisdictions indicates a more abbreviated interval than that  
8 recommended by many of the parties is appropriate. The schedule for thousands-block number  
9 pooling in other jurisdictions has included shorter implementation intervals between NPAs. For  
10 example, at the July 17, 2001, First Implementation Meeting for Indiana NPAs 217 and 319, the  
11 Industry agreed upon a one month interval.

12 24. Therefore, Staff recommends that a one month interval be utilized between the 602 and  
13 480 NPAs for thousands-block number pooling.

14 **D. If the geographic area of a NPA is greater than the MSA, should number pooling be**  
15 **implemented in the entire NPA?**

16 25. AT&T, Time Warner, Winstar and WorldCom recommend that where the geographic  
17 area of a NPA is larger than a MSA, number pooling be implemented in the entire NPA.<sup>8</sup> Winstar  
18 stated that dividing a NPA for purposes of pooling adds a layer of complexity that is unnecessary.  
19 AT&T commented that by not implementing pooling in the entire NPA, the benefit of prolonging  
20 the life of the NPA would diminished. Cox had no position on the question. Qwest supported  
21 implementing pooling in rate centers that are within the geographic boundaries of the MSA in  
22 accordance with FCC guidelines.<sup>9</sup>

23 26. Staff concurs with Qwest, FCC guidelines do not currently allow for implementation  
24 of number pooling in rate centers of a NPA that are outside the geographic area of the MSA. Staff  
25 also concurs with the majority of commenters that additional benefits can be gained when polling is  
26 implemented across an entire NPA. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Industry voluntarily

27 <sup>7</sup> WorldCom Comments at p. 2.

28 <sup>8</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 2; Time Warner Comments at p. 5; Winstar Comments at p. 2; WorldCom Comments at pps. 2-3.

<sup>9</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 3.

1 implement number pooling in all rate centers in a NPA where Local Number Portability ("LNP") has  
2 been established and that wireline non-LNP carriers be excluded from the pool until such time as they  
3 are required to become LNP capable due to a bona fide request ("BFR").

4 **E. How soon in 2001 might a number pooling trial begin?**

5 27. Generally, AT&T, Cox and WorldCom recommend that implementation of number  
6 pooling commence in third quarter, 2001.<sup>10</sup> The recommendation of Qwest and Winstar would place  
7 implementation in fourth quarter, 2001.<sup>11</sup> Time Warner recommends deferring until the national  
8 implementation of number pooling.<sup>12</sup> WorldCom also recommends that a criteria for the  
9 implementation of pooling be the availability of NPAC software release 3.0.<sup>13</sup>

10 28. Staff agrees with WorldCom that it would be preferable to implement pooling once  
11 NPAC software release 3.0 is available, since this software release improves the efficiency of  
12 transmitting pooling data. The availability of this release has been rescheduled and it is currently  
13 anticipated that it will be available in late 4Q2001. Pending NPAC software 3.0's release, software  
14 release 1.4 has been installed at the Western Region NPAC and is available to support a pooling trial  
15 in Arizona. To the extent release 3.0 is not available, Staff believes that release 1.4 is sufficient and  
16 is not of itself reason enough to delay timely implementation of number pooling in Arizona.

17 29. Other considerations are avoiding conflict with the implementation of the 520/928 NPA  
18 split, pooling trials that may have been scheduled in other portions of the Western NPAC Region and  
19 the ability of the National Pooling Administrator to support additional state pooling trials.

20 30. After considering the comments of the parties and the factors discussed above, Staff  
21 recommends that number pooling for the first NPA commence in January 2002. Staff believes this  
22 will provide the Industry sufficient time for planning, increase the possibility for availability of NPAC  
23 software release 3.0, and minimize the potential for conflict with other pooling trials.

24 ...

25 ...

26  
27 <sup>10</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 4; Cox Comments at p. 2; WorldCom Comments at p. 3.

28 <sup>11</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 5; Winstar Comments at p. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Time Warner Comments at p. 5.

<sup>13</sup> WorldCom Comments at p. 3.



**F. How should number pooling costs be allocated?**

31. AT&T recommends that number pooling costs should be allocated to all carriers in the State.<sup>14</sup> Cox and Winstar recommend that number pooling costs be allocated to all carriers providing service in the number pooling area.<sup>15</sup> Qwest, Time Warner and WorldCom all advocated that costs should be allocated across all carriers but did not explicitly indicate a geographic scope.<sup>16</sup>

32. Number conservation positively benefits all telecommunications carriers in the State. Number pooling will delay the need for area code relief, particularly in metropolitan NPAs, which allows all carriers to avoid the additional costs that would be incurred due to any relief plan. Furthermore, section 252 (e) (2) requires that all telecommunications carriers bear the cost of numbering administration and in its NRO Order the FCC concluded "*that the costs of thousands-block number pooling be allocated to all telecommunications carriers....*" *Id.* at para. 20.

33. With respect to the method of allocation, AT&T, Qwest and WorldCom all essentially recommend that the FCC LNP cost model be used. Under the FCC LNP cost model, joint-industry costs would be allocated to all telecommunications carriers in proportion to each carrier's interstate, intrastate and international telecommunications revenues. Cox, Time Warner, and Winstar, on the other hand, generally recommend that cost should be allocated among carriers based on the number of access lines served by a specific carrier in relation to the total number of access lines in the area designated for cost allocation.

34. Staff recommends that cost allocation methodology for the Arizona pooling trials be based upon pro rata allocation of cost to all telecommunications carriers providing service within the state in proportion to each carrier's interstate, intrastate and international telecommunications revenues; irrespective of whether carriers may or may not participate in the pooling trial. Staff believes this approach is consistent with the approach used by the FCC in the LNP context and is competitively neutral.

...

...

---

<sup>14</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Cox Comments at p. 2; Winstar Comments at p. 2.

<sup>16</sup> Qwest Comments at pps. 3-6; Time Warner Comments at p. 5-6; WorldCom Comments at p. 3.

**G. How should number pooling costs be recovered?**

35. Commenters generally identified two types of costs that the industry would incur that the FCC has determined could be subject to recovery. They were (1) joint-industry costs and (2) carrier-specific costs directly related to number pooling ("carrier-specific costs"). Joint-industry costs include costs to update LNP databases with each telephone number added to the pool, costs of the NPAC's software capability and costs due to the Pooling Administrator. Carrier-specific costs include costs directly related to thousands-block number pooling implementation such as enhancements to a carrier's Service Control Point ("SCP") and Operational Support Systems ("OSS") systems.

36. All commenters concurred that joint-industry costs should be subject to a recovery mechanism. Qwest recommends that carrier-specific costs directly related to thousands-block number pooling also be subject to a recovery mechanism.<sup>17</sup> AT&T, Cox, Time Warner, Winstar and WorldCom, on the other hand, recommend that carrier-specific costs should be the responsibility of each carrier.<sup>18</sup> As succinctly stated by AT&T in its response, "...the costs each carrier will incur to modify its own systems and network to operate in a number pooling environment are merely costs of doing business that each carrier can, and should, bear itself". AT&T Comments at p. 3.

37. AT&T and WorldCom also emphasized that number pooling costs must be recovered in a competitively neutral manner and that recovery methods should not permit one carrier to recover its pooling costs from another. If carrier-specific cost recovery were permitted by the ACC, AT&T recommended that the recovery method not permit recovery from access charges, unbundled network elements total service resale rate elements or any other wholesale rates.

38. In its July 20, 2000, Order delegating authority to implement number pooling to Arizona and certain other States, the FCC indicated that States conducting their own pooling trials must develop their own cost recovery mechanism and that the State cost-recovery mechanisms must transition to the national cost-recovery plan when the latter becomes effective. *Id.* at ¶ 21. The FCC's NRO Order specifically states, "Until national thousands-block number pooling is implemented, states may use their current cost recovery mechanisms..." Order at ¶ 197.

<sup>17</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 9.

<sup>18</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 6; Cox Comments at p. 2; Time Warner Comments at p. 6; Winstar Comments at p. 2; WorldCom Comments at p. 3.

39. Staff concurs that joint-industry costs should be subject to a recovery mechanism. Further, Staff concurs with the majority of commenters that carrier-specific costs are merely costs of doing business and should not be subject to a special cost recovery mechanism. Competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") and incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") may seek recovery through their respective regulatory paradigms; i.e. tariff filings, rate cases or to the extent permitted under the terms of an alternative form of regulation ("AFOR") plan. Finally, Staff recommends that recovery from access charges, unbundled network elements total service resale rate elements or any other wholesale rates not be permitted.

40. In the alternative, if the Commission determines that carrier-specific costs be subject to recovery through a special cost recovery mechanism, Staff recommends that a State cost recovery mechanism be addressed in a future docket to allow development of a more complete record.

**H. Are there unique aspects of your network in Arizona as compared to those found in States where number pooling has already been implemented?**

41. AT&T, Cox, Time Warner, Winstar and WorldCom concurred that there were no unique aspects to their network in Arizona as compared to their networks in other States where number pooling has already been implemented.<sup>19</sup> Qwest noted that the Phoenix rate center is three separate NPAs that will require distinct pools and implementation schedules.<sup>20</sup> In addition, Qwest recommended that a pooling schedule not conflict with the area code split that is scheduled for the 520 NPA.

**I. Are there rate centers within the State that can be consolidated? If so which ones and how soon could it be accomplished?**

42. AT&T indicated support for rate center consolidation but did not recommend a specific consolidation plan.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, Winstar supports rate center consolidation, but expressed caution to insure 911 default routing is minimally impacted.<sup>22</sup> Winstar concluded its comments, however, by stating its belief that there were no appropriate rate centers within Arizona that could be consolidated.

<sup>19</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 5; Cox Comments at p. 2; Time Warner Comments at p. 6; Winstar Comments at p. 3; WorldCom Comments at p. 4.

<sup>20</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 10.

<sup>21</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 5.

<sup>22</sup> Winstar Comments at p. 3.

1 Qwest also supports rate center consolidation on a case-by-case basis.<sup>23</sup> Qwest recommended that  
2 any such consolidations be revenue and expense neutral and occur between rate centers within the  
3 same local calling area.

4 43. Qwest expressed concern, however, that rate center consolidation might make it more  
5 difficult for carriers to meet the utilization threshold and months-to-exhaust criteria mandated by the  
6 FCC which are determined on rate center basis. After studying its thirteen rate centers that share  
7 common local calling, Qwest concluded that they were not strong candidates for consolidation  
8 because only two NXX codes would have been saved over a two-year period.

9 44. Cox and WorldCom took no position on the subject. Time Warner indicated there are  
10 issues with rate center consolidation which it has not examined and reserved its right to supplement  
11 its response at a later date.<sup>24</sup>

12 45. In its July 20, 2000, Order delegating authority to implement number pooling to  
13 Arizona and certain other States, the FCC strongly encouraged State regulatory commissions to  
14 proceed as expeditiously as possible to consolidate rate centers. Id. at para. 59. Where multiple rate  
15 centers exist in a local calling area, rate center consolidation will reduce the number of NXX codes  
16 a new entrant will need to provide service in the calling area. In addition, it will avoid hardship to  
17 consumers. Many rural communities in Arizona are now in the process of having to change to their  
18 third area code (from 602 to 520 to 928). Implementation of a number conservation method that may  
19 prolong the life of rural NPA's will benefit both the public and Industry by deferring the costs,  
20 administrative burden and confusion due to area code relief as long as possible.

21 46. Staff does not recommend, at this time, consolidation of rate centers that do not  
22 currently have the same local calling area. This should be evaluated in the context of a rate case.  
23 However, Staff does recommend rate center consolidation where multiple rate centers currently have  
24 the same local calling area and further recommends that such rate center consolidations become  
25 effective within twelve months of the effective date of this Order. The following are illustrative of  
26 ...

27  
28 <sup>23</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 10-12.

<sup>24</sup> Time Warner Comments at p. 6.

where rate center consolidation may be possible and that should be evaluated by the incumbent wireline local exchange carriers.

<u>Rate Centers in Calling Area</u>	<u>Proposed Consolidated Rate Center</u>
Globe, Miami	Globe
Casa Grande, Coolidge, Eloy, Florence, Maricopa	Casa Grande
Ash Fork, Cameron, Flagstaff, Munds Park, Williams	Flagstaff
Chino Valley, Humbolt, Prescott	Prescott
Camp Verde, Cottonwood, Sedona	Sedona
Joseph City, Winslow	Winslow
Nogales, Patagonia	Nogales
Wellton, Yuma	Yuma
Aguila, Wickenburg, Yarnell	Wickenburg
Roosevelt Lake, Tonto Basin	Roosevelt Lake
Golden Valley, Kingman	Kingman

**J. What degree of contamination (i.e. 5%, 10%, etc.) should be allowed in thousands-blocks donated to the numbering pool?**

47. AT&T, Cox, Qwest, Time Warner and WorldCom generally recommend that the ACC follow the established national guidelines and require that all thousands-blocks that have no more than ten percent contamination be considered for donations to the pool.<sup>25</sup> Winstar recommends that only uncontaminated blocks be allowed in numbering pools.<sup>26</sup>

48. Staff concurs with the majority of commenters. National guidelines have been established by the FCC in its NRO Order which require all carriers to donate all thousands-blocks that have less than a ten-percent contamination level to the thousands-block number pool for each rate center. Id. at ¶ 191.

...

...

<sup>25</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 5; Cox Comments at p. 3; Qwest Comments at p. 12; Time Warner Comments at p. 7; WorldCom Comments at p. 4.

<sup>26</sup> Winstar Comments at p. 3.

**K. What other issues should be addressed as part of a pooling trial?**

49. AT&T referenced selection of a Pooling Administrator ("PA"), the North American Portability Management ("NAPM") Limited Liability Corporation ("LLC") entering into a contract with the selected PA, determination of a cost recovery methodology and cost allocation as issues to be addressed.<sup>27</sup> Cox recommended that procedures for monitoring and enforcing compliance should be in place prior to the start of a number pooling trial.<sup>28</sup> Qwest recommended that number pooling criteria for a trial conform to national standards.<sup>29</sup> Time Warner recommended that pooled numbers be readily available to carriers with a demonstrated need.<sup>30</sup> Winstar recommended the ACC give equal weight to the proposals of any potential bidders for a PA in Arizona.<sup>31</sup> WorldCom had no comment on this topic.

50. Staff generally concurs with the recommendations of the commenters. Further, the FCC in its NRO Order and in the NRO Second Report and Order has established the national framework of standards that addresses the concerns expressed by some of the commenters.

**L. What additional number conservation methods may be implemented to maximize the life of the NPAs within Arizona?**

51. AT&T identified thousands-block number pooling as the next logical step since rate center consolidation has already been implemented in both Phoenix and Tucson.<sup>32</sup> Cox recommended that unassigned number pooling should be implemented.<sup>33</sup> Qwest recommended that the Industry should comply with the number conservation methods defined in the FCC NRO Order and that the ACC should periodically review each service provider's number utilization reports.<sup>34</sup> Time Warner and WorldCom had no comments on this issue. Winstar expressed conviction that ten-digit dialing could be the single most effective means of conserving the number resource.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> AT&T Comments at pps. 5-6.

<sup>28</sup> Cox Comments at p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 12.

<sup>30</sup> Time Warner Comments at p. 7.

<sup>31</sup> Winstar Comments at p. 4.

<sup>32</sup> AT&T Comments at p. 6.

<sup>33</sup> Cox Comments at p. 3.

<sup>34</sup> Qwest Comments at p. 12.

<sup>35</sup> Winstar Comments at p. 4.

52. While Staff has no recommendations on additional conservation measures at this time, other than future rate center consolidation where appropriate, Staff believes the Commission should continue to consider ways to conserve numbers in Arizona.

#### IV. SELECTION OF A POOLING ADMINISTRATOR

53. NeuStar and Telcordia submitted a proposal and bid to serve as an Interim Thousands-Block PA in Arizona. In its response NeuStar indicated that its pooling administration services had expanded to encompass 12 States covering 35 individual NPAs. In its response Telcordia identified three states where it had been selected as pooling administrator. Subsequent to submission of their proposals, both companies have been selected as PA for additional State number pooling trials.

54. Both NeuStar and Telcordia have proven the experience and ability necessary to provide administration services pursuant to the Federal rules and Industry guidelines relating to thousands-block number pooling.

55. Recently, on June 18, 2001, the FCC announced that it had selected NeuStar as the National Thousands-Block Number Pooling Administrator. Where State pooling trials have been implemented, the National PA must develop and establish a transition plan for the transition/transfer of number pooling administration from the interim State PA to the National PA. (See Thousands-Block Pooling Contractor, Technical Requirements, Section 2.10.8, November 30, 2000)

56. On July 25, 2001, Telcordia notified Staff that it would no longer like to be considered as a potential bidder for the Arizona thousands-block pooling trial. Therefore, Staff recommends that NeuStar administer thousands-block number pooling ordered by the ACC.

#### V. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

57. Staff recommends that thousands-block number pooling be implemented in Arizona to conserve numbering resources as follows subject to the conditions identified below:

- a. That thousands-block number pooling be implemented in the 602 NPA in the Phoenix MSA no later than February 14, 2002.
- b. That thousands-block number pooling be implemented in the 480 NPA in the Phoenix MSA no later than March 14, 2002.
- c. That implementation of number pooling may commence before the availability of

NPAC software release 3.0.

- d. That the cost allocation methodology for the Arizona pooling trials be based upon pro rata allocation of cost to all telecommunications carriers providing service within the State in proportion to each carrier's interstate, intrastate and international telecommunications revenues; irrespective of whether carriers may or may not participate in the pooling trial.
- e. That joint-industry costs should be subject to a recovery mechanism and that carrier-specific costs be treated as a cost of doing business and should not be subject to a special cost recovery mechanism. CLECs and ILECs may seek recovery through their respective regulatory paradigms; i.e. tariff filings, rate cases or to the extent permitted under the terms of an AFOR plan. Recovery from access charges, unbundled network elements total service resale rate elements or any other wholesale rates should not be permitted.
- f. That, if the ACC decides not to address cost recovery issues at this time, a State cost recovery mechanism be addressed in a future docket.
- g. That rate center consolidation be implemented where multiple rate centers currently have the same local calling area and that such rate center consolidation become effective within twelve months of this Order. That carriers may submit comment within 30 days of the effective date of this Order identifying any concerns with the rate center consolidation set forth in Finding of Fact 46.
- h. That any future rate case filed by incumbent wireline carriers include an analysis of where de minimis expansion of local calling areas would allow further consolidation of rate centers to maximize use of numbering resources.
- i. That NeuStar be selected as the interim State Pooling Administrator to administer implementation of number pooling addressed in this Order.
- j. That pursuant to Federal rules effective July 17, 2000, et al, all carriers be reminded they are required to have implemented and be in compliance with number conservation administration and reporting requirements.



- 1 k. That if any carrier providing service in one of the top 100 MSAs located in Arizona  
2 currently is not providing LNP capability as required by the FCC, such carrier must  
3 implement LNP in time to participate in numbering pooling for each MSA unless it  
4 applies for and is granted a LNP waiver by the FCC.

5 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 6 1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this investigation.  
7 2. The recitals of Fact set forth above and Conclusions of Law are supported by the record  
8 and are hereby adopted as Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.  
9 3. The record in this proceeding supports adoption of thousands-block number pooling  
10 as a number conservation method and Staff Recommendations in Findings of Fact No. 57 are  
11 reasonable, fair, equitable and therefore in the public interest.

12 ORDER

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that thousands-block number pooling in the 602 NPA of the  
14 Phoenix MSA be implemented no later than February 14, 2002.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that thousands-block number pooling in the 480 NPA of the  
16 Phoenix MSA be implemented no later than March 14, 2002.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all LNP capable carriers in the MSA and holding codes in  
18 the 602 and 480 NPAs shall participate in the number pool.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that NeuStar is selected as the interim State Pooling  
20 Administrator and shall administer implementation of thousands-block number pooling addressed in  
21 this Order.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that NAPM, LLC is hereby requested to enter into a contract  
23 with NeuStar for the administration of thousands-block number pooling addressed in this Order.

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that NeuStar shall convene a First Implementation Meeting with  
25 Industry for thousands-block number pooling in the Phoenix MSA during September, 2001.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Staff shall review any request from NeuStar to revise these  
27 implementation dates to resolve conflicts with implementation of other State pooling trials and, upon  
28 ...

1 its concurrence with any change of schedule, Staff shall file a report with the ACC and Docket  
2 Control to provide notice of the revision.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that implementation of thousands-block number pooling shall  
4 not be delayed until the availability of NPAC software release 3.0.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the cost allocation methodology for the Arizona pooling  
6 trials be based upon pro rata allocation of cost to all telecommunications carriers providing service  
7 within the State in proportion to each carrier's interstate, intrastate and international  
8 telecommunications revenues; irrespective of whether carriers may or may not participate in the  
9 pooling trial.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that joint-industry costs should be subject to a recovery  
11 mechanism and that carrier-specific costs are not recoverable by a special cost recovery mechanism  
12 since they are merely costs of doing business. That competitive local exchange carriers and  
13 incumbent local exchange carriers may seek recovery through their respective regulatory paradigms;  
14 i.e. tariff filings, rate cases or to the extent permitted under the terms of an alternative form of  
15 regulation plan.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that recovery from access charges, unbundled network elements  
17 total service resale rate elements or any other wholesale rates should not be permitted.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that rate center consolidation be implemented where multiple  
19 rate centers currently have the same local calling area and that such rate center consolidation become  
20 effective within twelve months of this Order. That carriers may submit comment within 30 days of  
21 the effective date of this Order identifying any concerns with the rate center consolidation set forth  
22 in Finding of Fact 46.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within ninety days of this Order, the incumbent wireline  
24 carriers shall file with the Utilities Division Compliance Section a report identifying the rate centers  
25 to be consolidated and the scheduled effective date. Each carrier shall also file a final report with the  
26 Utilities Division Compliance Section within thirty days of completion of its rate center consolidation.

27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any future rate case filed by incumbent wireline carriers  
28 ...

1 include an analysis of where de minimis expansion of local calling areas would allow further  
2 consolidation of rate centers to maximize use of numbering resources.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Federal rules effective July 17, 2000, et al, all  
4 carriers are reminded they are required to have implemented and be in compliance with number  
5 conservation administration and reporting requirements; for example, but not limited to, use of  
6 sequential number assignment and restrictions on unnecessary contamination of unused thousands-  
7 blocks.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if any carrier providing service in one of the top 100 MSAs  
9 located in Arizona currently is not providing LNP capability as required by the FCC, such carrier must  
10 implement LNP in time to participate in thousands-block numbering pooling for each MSA unless  
11 it applies for and is granted a LNP waiver by the FCC.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall be effective immediately.

13 **BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

14   
15 CHAIRMAN

14   
15 COMMISSIONER

15 COMMISSIONER

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL,  
17 Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation  
18 Commission, have hereunto, set my hand and caused the  
19 official seal of this Commission to be affixed at the Capitol,  
20 in the City of Phoenix, this 30th day of August, 2001.

21   
22 BRIAN C. McNEIL  
23 Executive Secretary

24 DISSENT: \_\_\_\_\_

25 SMO:RLB:bsl/MAS  
26  
27  
28

1 DOCKET NO. T-00000A-01-0076

2

3 Linda Hymans  
4 Regulatory/Compliance Manager  
5 NeuStar, Inc.  
6 Number Pooling Services  
7 1006 Lone Buck Pass  
8 Cedar Park, TX 78613

9 Regulatory Contact  
10 Accipiter Communications  
11 Post Office Box 11929  
12 Glendale, AZ 85318

13 ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc., dba e-spire  
14 133 National Business Parkway, Suite 100  
15 Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

16 Robert W. McCausland  
17 Allegiance Telecom of Arizona, Inc.  
18 1950 Stemmons Freeway  
19 Suite 3026  
20 Dallas, TX 75207-3118

21 Alltel Communications  
22 2125 East Adams Street  
23 Phoenix, AZ 85034

24 Arch Paging, Inc.  
25 1800 West Park Drive, Suite 250  
26 Westborough, MA 01581-3926

27 Richard S. Wolters  
28 AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc.  
1875 Lawrence St., Suite 1575  
Denver, CO 80202

29 Cindy Manheim  
30 AT&T Wireless Services  
31 7277 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue North East  
32 Redmond, WA 98052

33

34

35

- 1 Mark J. Trierweiler
- 2 Government Affairs Vice President
- 3 AT&T
- 4 1875 Lawrence Street, Suite 15-22
- 5 Denver, CO 80202
- 6
- 7 Brooks Fiber Communications of Tucson
- 8 c/o Thomas F. Dixon
- 9 MCI WorldCom, Inc.
- 10 707 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3900
- 11 Denver, CO 80202
- 12
- 13 Tim Rogers
- 14 CapRock Communications Corp.
- 15 15601 North Dallas Parkway
- 16 Suite 700
- 17 Dallas, TX 75248
- 18
- 19 CenturyTel Service Group
- 20 805 Broadway
- 21 Vancouver, WA 9860-3277
- 22
- 23 Curt Huttshell, Ph.D., Director
- 24 State Government Affairs, Weat
- 25 Citizens Communications
- 26 4 Triad Center
- 27 Suite 200
- 28 Salt Lake City, UT 84180
- 18 Copper Valley Telephone, Inc.
- 19 P.O. box 970
- 20 Willcox, AZ 85644
- 21
- 22 Bradley S. Carroll
- 23 Cox Communications
- 24 20401 North 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- 25 Phoenix, AZ 85027
- 26
- 27 Dobson Cellular Systems
- 28 13439 North Broadway Extension
- 13439 North Broadway Extension
- Oklahoma City, OK 73114
- 25
- 26 Penny Bewick
- 27 Electric Lightwave Inc.
- 28 4400 NE 77<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Vancouver, WA 98662

1 Garth Morrisette  
Director, Regulatory Affairs  
2 Eschelon Telecom of Arizona, Inc.  
730 Second Avenue South, Suite 1200  
3 Minneapolis, MN 55402-2456  
4  
Jerry G. Kirby, Tariff Manager  
5 Regulatory Affairs  
Excel Telecommunications, Inc.  
6 8750 North Central Expressway, Suite 2000  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
7  
8 Cathy Murray  
Manager, State Regulatory Group  
9 Frontier Local Services - AZ  
1221 Nicollette Mall, suite 300  
10 Minneapolis, MN 55403  
11  
Regulatory Contact  
12 Gila River Telecommunications, Inc.  
7065 West Allison  
13 Chandler, AZ 85226  
14  
Director, Government Affairs  
15 GST Net - AZ  
GST Telecom  
16 One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren, Suite 350  
17 Phoenix, AZ 58004  
18  
Wayne Mark  
19 Handy Page  
841 West Fairmount, Suite 5  
20 Tempe, AZ 85282  
21  
Regulatory Contact  
22 Intermedia Communications, Inc.  
3625 Queen Palm Drive  
23 Tampa, FL 33619-1309  
24  
Level 3 Communications  
25 1025 Eldorado Boulevard  
Broomfield, CO 80021  
26  
Thomas F. Dixon  
27 MCI WorldCom, Inc.  
707 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3900  
28 Denver, CO 80202

- 1 Regulatory Contact
- 2 MetroCall, Inc.
- 3 6910 Richmond Hwy
- 4 Alexandria, VA 22306
- 5
- 6 Midvale Telephone Exchange, Inc.
- 7 P.O. Box 7
- 8 2205 Keithley Creek Road
- 9 Midvale, ID 83645
- 10
- 11 Thomas Carter
- 12 Mohave Wireless
- 13 3707 Stockton Hill Road, Suite B
- 14 Kingman, AZ 86401
- 15
- 16 Mountain Telecommunications, Inc.
- 17 10190 East McKellips Road
- 18 Scottsdale, AZ 85256
- 19
- 20 Regulatory Contact
- 21 Nationwide Paging, Inc.
- 22 2313 West Burbank Blvd
- 23 Burbank, CA 91506
- 24
- 25 James F. Kenefick
- 26 Net-tel Corporation
- 27 11921 Freedom Drive, Suite 550
- 28 Reston, VA 20190
- 29
- 30 Regulatory Contact
- 31 Network Services, L.L.C.
- 32 525 South Douglas St.
- 33 El Segundo, CA 90245
- 34
- 35 Nextel Communications, Inc.
- 36 2003 Edmund Halley Drive
- 37 Reston, VA 20191
- 38
- 39 Todd Lesser
- 40 North County Telecommunications
- 41 3802 Rosencrans, Suite 485
- 42 San Diego, CA 92110
- 43
- 44 Richard P. Kolb
- 45 OnePoint Communications – Colorado
- 46 Two Conway Park
- 47 150 Field Drive, Suite 300
- 48 Lake Forest, IL 60045

1 Regulatory Contact  
Optel (Arizona) Telecom, Inc.  
2 1111 West Mockingbird Ln  
Suite 1000  
3 Dallas, TX 75247

4 Jeff Webster  
5 Pac-West Telecomm, Inc.  
1776 March Lane, Suite 250  
6 Stockton, CA 95207

7 Jeff Hayes  
8 Pagenet  
2525 East Camelback Road, Suite 1000  
9 Phoenix, AZ 85254

10 Terrence Peck  
11 Prism Arizona Operations, LLC  
1667 K Street, NW, Suite 200  
12 Washington, DC 20006

13 Rio Virgin Telephone Company, Inc.  
P.O. Box 189  
14 Estacada, OR 97023

15 San Carlos Apache Telecommunications  
16 P.O. Box 158  
10 Tonto Street  
17 San Carlos, AZ 85550

18 Richard Watkins  
19 Smith Bagley, Inc. dba Cellular One of NE Arizona  
1500 South White Mountain Road  
20 Show Low, AZ 85901

21 South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc.  
22 P.O. Box 226  
Escalante, UT 84726

23 Eric S. Heath  
24 Sprint Communications Company, L.P.  
25 100 Spear Street, suite 930  
San Francisco, CA 94105

26 John Hayes  
27 Table Top Telephone Company, Inc.  
28 600 N. Second Avenue  
Ajo, AZ 85321



1 Manager External Relations

TDS Telecom (dba Arizona Telephone, Southwestern Telephone)

2 2495 North Main Street

P.O. Box 220

3 Choctaw, OK 73020-0220

4 Jennifer Seeger-Martin

5 Teligent Services, Inc.

8065 Leesburg Pike

6 Suite 400

7 Vienna, VA 22182

8 Gary Yaquinto

Time Warner Telecom, Inc.

9 3003 North Central Avenue

Suite 1600

10 Phoenix, AZ 85012

11 Tohono O'odham Utility Authority

12 P.O. Box 816

Sells, AZ 85634

13 Regulatory Contact

14 Touch Tone Interactive

15 5020 North 7<sup>th</sup> Street

Phoenix, AZ 85014

16 Valley Telecommunications Company

17 P.O. Box 1099

18 Willcox, AZ 85644

19 Valley Telephone Cooperative, Inc.

P.O. Box 970

20 Willcox, AZ 85643

21 Andrea Cooper

22 Numbering Director

Verizon Wireless

23 2785 Mitchell Drive, MS7-1

24 Walnut Creek, CA 94598

25 Shirley Smith

Voice Stream Wireless

26 2601 West Broadway

27 Tempe, AZ 85282

28

1 Regulatory Contact  
Winstar Wireless of Arizona  
2 1577 Spring Hill Road, #600  
Vienna, VA 22182  
3

4 Rex Knowles  
Vice President, Regulatory  
5 XO Communications  
111 East Broadway  
6 Suite 1000  
7 Salt Lake City, UT 84111

8 Thomas Campbell  
Lewis and Roca  
9 40 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4429  
10

11 Jeffrey Crockett  
Snell & Wilmer  
12 One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85001  
13

14 Richard Sallquist  
Sallquist & Drummond  
15 2525 East Arizona Biltmore Circle  
Suite 117  
16 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

17 Timothy Berg  
18 Fennemore Craig, P.C.  
3003 North Central Ave., Suite 2600  
19 Phoenix, AZ 85012

20 Michael M. Grant  
21 Todd C. Wiley  
Gallagher & Kennedy  
22 2575 East Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225  
23

24 Michael W. Patten  
Brown & Bain, P.A.  
25 2901 North Central Ave., Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 400  
26 Phoenix, AZ 85001-0400  
27  
28

1 Thomas L. Mumaw  
Snell & Wilmer  
2 One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren  
3 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
4  
5 Joan S. Burke  
Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
2929 North Central Avenue  
6 Suite 2100  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
7  
8 Steve Olea  
Acting Director - Utilities Division  
9 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
10 Phoenix, AZ 85007  
11  
12 Christopher C. Kempley  
Chief Counsel  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
13 1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28